



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bia University, has recently expressed similar views in condemning military training for school boys, and Dr. Sargent of Harvard University is equally emphatic.

Second. The teachers and educators of the United States are practically a unit in opposing this movement. The following statement appears in the resolutions adopted by the National Education Association at Oakland, California, in the summer of 1915: "The Association deplores any attempt to militarize this country. It again declares against the establishment of compulsory military training in the schools on the ground that it is reactionary and inconsistent with American ideals and standards."

Third. Military training in schools is utterly futile as a preparation for service in the field. The small amount of training that can be given, unsuited to the age and development of boyhood as above stated, is of no practical value.

Fourth. None of the great European countries at present engaged in warfare, committed as they are to militarism, is practising military training for its boys in the schools. Such a system was tried temporarily some time ago in both England and France, but was given up on account of its uselessness and futility.

Fifth. The development of a system of military training would entail great expense to no good purpose, interfere with the good working of the schools by introducing into the school system men out of touch with educational ideals and practices, and would introduce grave dangers in the form of militarism and a radical change in our national ideals.

Many other reasons could be given against military training. We are willing, however, to rest our opposition on the grounds above stated.

JOINING THE ISSUE

Controversy over a fact, affirmed by one side and denied by another, is known in law as an "issue." Taking up the two sides respectively is called "joining the issue." A great need of the peace movement in the argument with its opponents is first to "join the issue." With this aim in view this department was started in our August number, and it is hoped that many of our readers will be stirred to add their wisdom to this process of "joining the issue." Any intelligent contribution to the problem, if not too long, will be welcomed.—THE EDITOR.

DEAR SIR: As good luck or special providence provided, THE ADVOCATES OF PEACE for past year, which you kindly sent at my request, arrived Saturday afternoon. I found a speech by Bishop Hughes (M. E. Church), former president of De Pauw University, across the street from which is Locust Street Church, in which I spoke. He was for *referendum on war* in his speech, and as that was one of my points, I was as tickled as a boy with a new pup to receive your paper with the speech in endorsing my point. I thank you very much. The preacher rather kerflummuxed me by his introduction. He said I was a sort of a John the Baptist. I think my blue jeans, which I wore as always, must have put that notion in his head. He went on to say how Indiana State University had called me to speak there as representing country views on the proposed State constitution convention, and at another time to discuss taxation at an Indianapolis convention, and that I was quite a person, all of which gave me the blues and made me wonder how the people would take my poor little remarks after such an introduction! It was quite generous, however, of him, considering he has been my pastor about six years and I have never heard him preach once. He explained to people, however, that I am an invalid. I do not appear in church or other meetings unless some cause is not being represented, and nothing has been done about peace here of consequence, while the newspapers are loaded with a Noah's deluge of militarism. So I had to do or die. It did look like I was liable to do the latter first. Such misery I had trying to write, and could not. But the weather became milder on Saturday, and that helped very much. I worked right up to meeting time, instead of getting a rest first. Apparently the meeting was a very satisfactory success. You asked me to let you know, so I have written you, and also send a county paper. Besides the referendum, I boosted what I call *The Indiana Peace Plan*, namely, a

Department of Peace, with secretary. There are two military secretaries (War and Navy), and a neutrality secretary (Department of State), and nobody to represent the people who are for peace, and the President's surroundings are all against peace. Furthermore, we must have some one at work continuously on *large* plans of peace work at *big expense*, just as big as is appropriated for the killers. My general theme was that militarism is a series of lies, and the truth would free people. Parades show brass buttons, gold braid, expert music, pretty manoeuvres, etc., when they should show men with gas masks on their faces, spades in their hands, mud all over, doing trench digging just like sewer diggers, but with no "safety first" being provided. Another lie mentioned was using Luther's mistranslated grand peace hymn, "A mighty fortress is our God," for a war hymn, when he wrote it *against war*, and prevented war, as D'Aubigne tells at length.

I am tickled about another thing. It seems I defeated the *League to Enforce Peace* crowd of "Big Bugs." When I saw in the newspaper last summer that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States was going to referendum the propositions of the League to Enforce Peace, I wrote and requested they divide No. 3 into two referendums: (1) Economic and other public opinion pressure, and (2) military force.

A recent newspaper item reports on the referendum, and says that No. 3 was submitted *just as I requested* (of course the item does not mention my request), and *behold!*—the paper says the economic division was endorsed and the *military proposal voted down!* WHOOP! And, further, it proves my proposition that truth, by its own reasonableness, defends itself—*first*, that my request to divide was granted, and, *second*, that the referendum voted against militarism. Personally I did not have any power, never having been in any way connected with any chamber of commerce nor being known to anybody. I was merely the hard-working organ-pumper back behind, who enabled the audience to sing the right tune by inducing the organ to work right.

Also, I recently sent a peace letter to Mr. N. H. Dole. He (like Philip) goeth and findeth his brother, Rev. C. F. Dole, and he forthwith read it to the Boston Preachers' Meeting! Mr. Dole writes me "it was received with joy and applause."

I reckon I had better retire now while the retiring is

good. But when I reflect that this miserable little invalid, living alone for twelve years in his log cabin, has been used by God to turn the business men of the United States in the right direction by referendum division, to address the Boston Preachers' Meeting, and to preach (though not a preacher) to our local church, including its attendance of some students from the university, I marvel at the weakness of the instruments God can choose when He decides to reach even a thousand miles away and oppose the world's Big Bugs.

Yours,

DANE S. DUNLOP.

"IS JAPAN DISMANTLING CHINA?"

Greater friendship between Japan and America is an object worth aiming for, and I as an American living in China present no objection thereto. But relations between China and Japan cannot be understood if relations between Japan and America are misunderstood.

In the October number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, under the above title, conclusions are drawn harmful to a correct view of China's rights in the world. I venture to explain. My criticisms of Japan do not arise from personal animosity, but from the facts.

"Kiao-chow is to be restored to China." Yes, but under two conditions—one that Japan shall have a Japanese concession, and the other that other nations have an international settlement. So long as extra-territoriality remains, Kiao-chow is only in name restored to China.

Speaking of Japan's new acquisitions, it is stated: "Her acquisitions are scarcely to be compared" with those of Russia, Great Britain, France, "Germany's former hold on Shantung," or "America's Standard Oil Company's sixty years' monopoly." As to the last, the Standard Oil Company has as yet no monopoly. But, positively, Japan acquires (if the thing goes through) *all* that Germany had acquired in Shantung, leading west into Honan and north into Chih-li; *all* that Russia had in South Manchuria, with new railway, and mining, and political rights there and in inner Mongolia; a re-assertion of prior influence in Fukien; a hold on the largest industrial undertaking in all China, at the very center of the country; and the right, if the British can be won over, to acquire railway concessions in the central provinces.

"China declares the inalienability of any part of the territory of Shantung or of any island along its coast" and, in another stipulation, of any harbor or island along the *whole* coast of China. This means that after Japan has gained Port Arthur and Dalny; after she has taken away Germany's one harbor; after she reserves to herself predominant influence at Foochow, as of the province of Fukien; after France has the island of Kuang-chow Wan; after England has Wei-hai-wei, Hongkong, and Kowloon, with predominant influence at Shanghai and other treaty ports, after all this, no country shall take any more. This plan thus firmly establishes Japan and her allies in China and excludes Germany and every other country from every possible harbor for their own use.

The new treaty as to South Manchuria "grants Japanese subjects the right to lease land, to travel, reside, and do business in the same region," *i. e.*, in all that

vast territory. Never before has any foreigner, except the missionary, been allowed such a right, and the rule was deemed wise, unless the foreigner came under Chinese law and rule. It will not be long before the Japanese will be everywhere in South Manchuria and do as they please, as in many places they are now doing. It is to be feared other nations will elsewhere make similar demands.

"China's integrity is more secure than it was before." What a glad surprise this message is to China! The conduct of Japan belies the statement. China's integrity is *threatened* as never before. It is guaranteed only in the way of yielding to Japan's ever-growing military domination, as before occurred in Korea, to the lasting resentment of all true Koreans.

"Japan gives the first promise to surrender her extra-territoriality." This promise first came about a decade ago in the new treaty of Great Britain and the United States, but on the condition, as Japan now insists, that China reform her laws and judiciary. This is a hope whose fulfillment must wait many a year.

There remains "Group V," touching the independence and free sovereignty of China. She refused to negotiate them, but when Japan issued an ultimatum and threatened war she could do no other, for preserving peace, but promise to negotiate them later on. Japan now holds this promise before China's eyes whenever further advantages are sought by Japan.

Japan is the one country of Asia representing militarism, worse, if viewed comparatively, than that of Germany in Europe.

Japan is always professing to desire "the peace of the Far East," but not once has she used peace methods. She fought China once for the peace of Korea. She fought Russia once for the peace of Manchuria, Korea, and all the Far East. She has lately fought Germany, *i. e.*, 5,000 Germans, also for the peace of the Far East. In each case she has ended in acquiring more territory, rights, or concessions. She has occupied with her military parts of China, and then threatened war when China dared to protest. Japan has so great an army and navy that she has no scruples in *forcing* China again and again to do what the stronger nation "*demand*s" or desires. Here it is Might that rules, but because Japan makes use of peace phraseology people in the home lands are deceived.

It may be all right for Japan to be the *leader*, if China really wants to follow, and, what is more, to submit. At present China yields, *nolens volens*. Japan in issuing "*demand*s" to China fails to realize that the country where the exactions are made is China and not Japan. More and more Japan is assuming the right to direct affairs in China, and from the beginning of the great war has treated China as a dependency and not as an equal, possessing independent sovereignty. If Americans criticise the policy of European powers, they should also criticise Japan.

GILBERT REID.

But we do criticise the policies of Japan in China, and, more pertinent, the people of Japan themselves have criticised official Japan for its attitude toward China. Japanese statesmen during the early months of last year did bring the two countries to the verge of war, in consequence of which they were called "blunderers" by their own people. Indeed, the Foreign Minister was forced to resign, and the govern-

ment was all but overthrown. Japan's one great ambition today, as regards China, is primarily commercial, and the revolutionary movement in China centers in no small way in Sun Yat Sen, who, ever since his separation from Yuan Shih-kai, has lived in Japan. The point we intended to emphasize in our editorial, however, is that the real interests of China are the real interests of Japan, and the real interests of Japan are the real interests of China. Our constant effort is to discover and stress the factors which bring nations together.—THE EDITOR.

PEACE AND WAR MEASURES BEFORE CONGRESS

(Legislation is introduced into either House of Congress, and bills or resolutions are numbered consecutively as filed. They are immediately referred to the appropriate committee, whose reports bring them to the originating House for passage. The following abbreviations are employed: S., Senate Bill; H. R., House of Representatives Bill; J. Res., Joint Resolution; Con. Res., Concurrent Resolution; Res., Resolution; Rept., Report; bills approved by the President become statutes, public or private, and are numbered in the order of enactment.)

China.

Mr. Adair of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6819) further to regulate the entrance of Chinese aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. Burnett of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 6046) to further regulate the entrance of Chinese aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. Hayes of California: A bill (H. R. 6062) to regulate the coming into and the residence within the United States of Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Tartars, Malays, Afghans, East Indians, Lascars, Hindoos, and other persons of the Mongolian or Asiatic race and persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tartar, Malayan, Afghan, East Indian, Hindoo, or other Mongolian extraction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Humphrey of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6047) to further regulate the admission of Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. Lodge of Massachusetts: A bill (S. 193) further to regulate the entrance of Chinese aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

For Mr. Saulsbury of Delaware: A bill (S. 4014) to supplement existing legislation relative to the United States court for China and to increase the serviceability thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Sherman of Illinois: Resolution (S. Res. 86) declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that the open door in China, as heretofore declared, interpreted, and applied on behalf of this country, is a necessary vital element in the foreign trade of the United States, and requesting the Executive, through the proper diplomatic channels, to protest to Japan against its recent demands made upon China, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Defense Establishment.

Mr. Britt of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9421) to extend the free mail privilege to official mail matter of the Organized Militia and Naval Militia of the several States and Territories of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. Britten of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9906) to establish a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11325) authorizing the President of the United States to transfer to the Department of Commerce vessels belonging to the Naval Establishment and to the War Department that are suitable for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. Caldwell of New York: A bill (H. R. 9328) creating an army reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Caldwell of New York: A bill (H. R. 11242) creating an army reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Capstick of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9800) to in-

crease the efficiency of the defenses of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Charles of New York: A bill (H. R. 11249) for deeper harbors on the Great Lakes as an adjunct of preparedness; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. Clark of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10578) to establish an aviation school and station at or near Fernandina, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Davis of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10663) to make classifications for military and naval service; to promote preparedness; to provide for adequate and efficient national defense; to require that in all naval and military services of the United States, whether in time of peace or war, wealth shall bear and perform its proportional part of the service, and that money shall be made to fight for its country the same as men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also H. R. 10771, by Mr. Davis of Texas.

Mr. Dyer of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10412) creating an army reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Flood of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10386) to tax munitions of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Humphrey of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9659) providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Kettner of California: A bill (H. R. 7635) providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Lea of Tennessee: A bill (S. 4312) to enlarge the military post of Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McKellar of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 238) to regulate promotion in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Newlands of Nevada: The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Committee on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the conditions relating to the national defense and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee; laid on table.

Mr. Phelan of California: A bill (S. 3970) providing for the construction and equipment of a storehouse at Benecia Arsenal, State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Pomerene of Ohio: A bill (S. 3946) to establish a reserve officers' training corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Reed of Missouri: A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to prohibit the employment of enlisted men in competition with civilian (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Saulsbury of Delaware: A bill (S. 4229) to encourage military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Stephens of California: A bill (H. R. 10664) authorizing the Secretary of War to investigate, examine, and report upon sites near Los Angeles, Cal., for the establishment of a brigade mobile army post for the better defense of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Tavenner of Illinois: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) to investigate the naval and military establishments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. Tavenner of Illinois: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) setting forth principles that should guide Congress in providing for national defense; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Works of California: A bill (S. 644) providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

International Affairs.

Mr. Clark of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) looking to the restoration of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Flood of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8235) to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; H. Rept. 45; amended, passed House; passed Senate.

Mr. Gallinger of New Hampshire: A bill (S. 649) making appropriation for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.